

### **REMARKS**

By this amendment, claims 6 and 8 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-12 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 6, 8, and 12 are independent claims.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 1-5 and 9-12 are allowed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least in Figures 7 and 8, and at page 10, lines 17-19 of the specification.

Entry of the Amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because it (a) places the application in *prima facie* condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration by the Examiner because similar subject matter was previously considered by the Examiner and thus further consideration and/or search by the Examiner is not warranted; (c) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary; and (d) responds to formal matters set forth by the Examiner.

For at least these reasons, entry of the present Amendment is therefore respectfully requested. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections for the reasons discussed below.

#### ***Drawing Objection/Amendments to the Drawings***

In the Office Action, Figures 1-6 are objected to as illustrating only that which is old. Accordingly, the examiner submits that these Figures should be designated by a legend such as Prior Art.

Attached hereto are replacement figure sheets for Figures 1-6, which have been labeled as PRIOR ART. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the drawing objection.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph***

Claims 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claim 6 has been amended to comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 6-7.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA").

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection improper.

AAPA fails to disclose every feature of claim 8 as amended. Claim 8 as amended recites, *inter alia*:

applying a second bias voltage to the sustain electrode after applying the falling ramp voltage, the second bias voltage having a voltage level lower than a voltage level of the first bias voltage; and  
applying a predetermined voltage to the scan electrode after applying the falling ramp voltage... (emphasis added)

AAPA fails to disclose at least these features. The examiner relies upon Fig. 3 to disclose these features. Specifically, the examiner asserts that V0 applied to the X electrode discloses "applying a second bias voltage to the sustain electrode." However, V0 applied to the X electrode fails to disclose this feature because in Fig. 3, V0 is not applied "after applying the falling ramp voltage." Additionally, the examiner relies upon Vset applied to the Y electrode to disclose the "predetermined voltage." However, Vset is not applied "after applying the falling ramp voltage." For at least these reasons, AAPA fails to disclose every feature of claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejection of claim 8. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8 is allowable.

***Other Matters***

In rejecting claim 8 over AAPA, the examiner also appears to be quoting language from claim 1. See Office Action, page 3, paragraph 6, line 3. However, as the examiner notes on page 5 of the Office Action, none of the cited art teaches or discloses every feature of claim 1. Consistent with the examiner's position on page 5 of the Office Action, Applicant submits that AAPA fails to disclose at least "maintaining the sustain electrode at a second bias voltage below the first bias voltage while maintaining the scan electrode at the predetermined voltage after the applying a falling ramp voltage" as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over AAPA.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 6-7 contain allowable subject matter. Claim 6 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 6-7 are in condition for allowance.

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 1-5 and 9-12 are allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: October 12, 2007

**CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027**  
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC  
8500 Leesburg Pike  
Suite 7500  
Vienna, VA 22182  
Tel: 703-288-5105  
Fax: 703-288-5139  
HCP:WMH/srb